

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXIX No. 26

December 26, 2017

266 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Bank of New York Mellon v. Mauro (Order), 327 C 986	104
Crouse v. Sloat (Order), 327 C 984	102
Freer v. Chien (Order), 327 C 987	105
Freer v. Fu (Order), 327 C 988	106
Girolametti v. Michael Horton Associates, Inc. (Orders), 327 C 980,981	98,99
Girolametti v. VP Buildings, Inc. (Orders), 327 C 982,983	100,101
Hull v. Newtown, 327 C 402	66
<i>Personal injury; summary judgment; immunity from statutory (§ 52-557n) municipal liability; whether police department policies governing arrests and prisoner transportation imposed ministerial, nondiscretionary duty on its officers to search individual taken into custody pursuant to civil commitment statute (§ 17a-503 [a]) and transported to hospital for emergency evaluation; discretionary and ministerial acts, distinguished.</i>	
Pereira v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 984	102
State v. Gill (Order), 327 C 987	105
State v. Hall-Davis (Order), 327 C 987	105
State v. Holmes (Order), 327 C 984	102
State v. Pugh (Order), 327 C 985	103
State v. Thomas (Order), 327 C 985	103
Toccaline v. Commissioner of Correction (Order), 327 C 986	104
Zhang v. 56 Locust Road, LLC (Order), 327 C 986	104
Williams v. Housing Authority, 327 C 338	2
<i>Negligence; recklessness; statutory (§ 52-557n) governmental immunity; summary judgment; certification from Appellate Court; whether Appellate Court correctly concluded that there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether municipal defendants' failure to inspect decedents' apartment for compliance with applicable fire safety codes and regulations, as required by statute (§ 29-305), constituted reckless disregard for health or safety under § 52-557n (b) (8); clarification of standard that governs reckless disregard exception in § 52-557n (b) (8), discussed.</i>	
Volume 327 Cumulative Table of Cases	107

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

Henry v. Imbruce, 178 CA 820	2A
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court erred in declining to vacate arbitration award for evident partiality where arbitrator had arbitrated divorce of attorney who represented certain defendants in separate malpractice action; whether fact that arbitrator rendered adverse decision in attorney's divorce amounted to evidence of bias; claim that arbitrator's initial disclosures of certain previous arbitrations required disclosure of all previous similar arbitrations; claim that arbitrator should have compelled plaintiffs to turn over documents pertinent to defendants' claim of damages; claim that defendants were denied full and fair hearing because they were deprived of opportunity to examine documents; claim that defendants were prejudiced by arbitrator's decision not to compel production of certain communications; claim that defendants were prejudiced by arbitrator's decision to allow plaintiffs to amend counterclaim after conclusion of discovery and less than three weeks before hearing; claim that arbitrator lacked authority to enter award against</i>	

(continued on next page)

<i>individual defendant; claim that arbitrator exceeded her authority under arbitration agreements by apportioning costs and imposing attorney's fees.</i>	
Starboard Resources, Inc. v. Henry (See Henry v. Imbruce), 178 CA 820	2A
Vitale v. Commissioner of Correction, 178 CA 844	26A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition sua sponte for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; claim that expired sexual assault conviction could be vacated on basis of collateral consequences where conviction allegedly was obtained in violation of right to counsel; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal as to challenge to conditions of parole and classification of petitioner as sex offender by Department of Correction; whether petitioner asserted cognizable liberty interest where he failed to plead that classification as sex offender was false and that he was compelled to participate in sex offender treatment; claim that violation of petitioner's right to counsel under article first, § 8, of state constitution was sufficient to establish jurisdiction in habeas court to adjudicate petitioner's claims.</i>	
Volume 178 Cumulative Table of Cases	57A
Colon v. Commissioner of Correction, 179 CA 30.	98A
<i>Habeas corpus; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for writ of habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by failing to adequately explain state's plea offer and by failing to oversee petitioner's cooperation with law enforcement in effort to reduce sentence; whether petitioner established that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance.</i>	
Doyle v. Universal Underwriters Ins. Co., 179 CA 9	77A
<i>Underinsured motorist benefits; whether trial court properly rendered summary judgment and determined that doctrine of collateral estoppel barred relitigation of amount of damages awarded to plaintiff in binding arbitration proceeding; whether issue of total compensatory damages resulting from motor vehicle collision was actually litigated and necessarily determined in prior binding arbitration proceeding.</i>	
Stack v. Hartford Distributors, Inc., 179 CA 22	90A
<i>Arbitration; whether trial court properly rendered judgment granting application for order to proceed to arbitration regarding termination of plaintiff's employment; claim that termination of plaintiff's employment did not involve dispute arising out of interpretation or enforcement of parties' employment agreement and, therefore, that arbitration provision contained in that agreement was not applicable; claim that employment contract was void and unenforceable; whether issue of validity of employment contract should be considered by arbitrator in first instance where party did not challenge arbitration clause in employment agreement.</i>	
State v. Jackson, 179 CA 40	108A
<i>Assault in first degree; tampering with witness; claim that evidence was insufficient to prove defendant's identity as perpetrator of stabbing to support conviction of</i>	

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
Office of Production and Distribution
111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, Publications Director

Published Weekly – Available at <http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
ERIC M. LEVINE, Reporter of Judicial Decisions
Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

assault in first degree; claim that evidence was insufficient to support conviction of tampering with witness; whether trial court reasonably could have found that defendant attempted to induce witness to testify falsely; claim that trial court improperly denied motion to dismiss tampering with witness charges; claim that state violated separation of powers doctrine when it added witness tampering charges to substitute information without judicial determination as to whether probable cause existed for added offenses; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's sixth amendment right to confrontation and abused its discretion when it prevented him from asking witness certain questions on recross-examination.

State <i>v. Mukhtaar</i> , 179 CA 1	69A
<i>Murder; claim that trial court abused its discretion in denying motions to correct illegal sentence and to allow expert witness to testify; claim that defendant's chronological age at time of crime was not representative of mental age; claim that trial court should have applied rationale of Miller v. Alabama (567 U.S. 460) and its progeny to adult defendant whose mental age, at time of crime, was not substantially different from that of juvenile; whether trial court was required under Miller necessarily and expressly to take defendant's mental state into consideration at sentencing where defendant was twenty years old at time of crime; whether defendant set forth colorable claim for relief under Miller; whether trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction over motion to correct illegal sentence; whether trial court properly denied motion to allow expert testimony.</i>	
Volume 179 Cumulative Table of Cases	127A

NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES

Social Services, Department of	1B
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS

Bar Examining Committee—List of Applicants	2C
Notice of Potential Claimants	1C
Revised Law Journal Deadlines	4C